

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 9, 2004 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-27 were pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 are amended and claims 2, 11, and 19 are canceled. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, on page 3, lines 25, to page 4, line 8, and page 5, lines 29-31. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, and 20-27 remain pending in this application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

As is shown on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-18, 20, 21, and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mithras C. Maurille et al. (US 6,484,196). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As to claim 1, the Office asserts that Maurille teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for presenting email threads, comprising the steps of: identifying the logical components of each message in a thread (Fig. 3B message in thread); determining the relationships between the messages in the thread using the logical components (col. 3, lines 40-65); and generating a document based upon the determined relationships (col. 10, lines 20-30).

In general, Maurille relates to a system and method that provides integrated combinations of threaded instant messages, open display bulletin boards, private bulletin boards, threaded e-mail, explicit acknowledgment of messages, and conferencing, whisper and talk modes. The system can be implemented in any Internet-based computer network, including the Internet, intranets and extranets. As another example, when implementing private bulletin boards, the server application creates private message boards for each user that allow each user to access only those messages in which he participates (as sender or recipient). When a user acknowledges a message, the server application closes the thread including the message and permits no additional activity in that thread. (Abstract)

In contrast, claim 1 recites a method for presenting email threads, comprising the steps of identifying the logical components of each message in a thread, determining the relationships between the messages in the thread using the logical components, and generating a document based upon the determined relationships, wherein any logical

components that are identified in each of the messages in the thread are removed during the generating step so that the generated document does not include the redundant logical components.

Maurille does not teach or suggest to remove redundant logical components from a generated document as is required by amended claim 1. Thus, Maurille does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons stated above, Maurille also fails to teach each and every feature of independent claims 10, 18, and 26, which each also recite claim elements directed to removing redundant logical components. For example, claim 10 recites a computer controlled display system comprising, in part, a processor that is adapted to remove any logical components that are identified in each of the messages in the thread so that the generated medium does not include the redundant logical components. Similarly, claim 18 recites an information storage media comprising, in part, information that removes any logical components that are identified in each message in an email thread so that the generated medium does not include the redundant logical components. Furthermore, claim 26 recites, in part, a computer system for presenting email threads comprising a computer processor for generating a medium based upon the determined relationships, wherein the e-mail threads are presented in the medium as semi-connected text, and wherein any logical components that are identified in each of the messages in the thread are removed during the generating step so that the generated medium does not include the redundant logical components.

Thus, Maurille also fails to teach each and every feature of claims 10, 18, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10, 18, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Moreover, by virtue of their dependency on allowable claims 1, 10, 18, and 26, Applicants also respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15-17, 20, 21, 23-25, and 27 be withdrawn.

As is shown on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 6, 11, 14, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mithras C. Maurille., (hereinafter Maurille) U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 in view of Costales et al., (hereinafter Costales) U.S. Patent No. 6,044,395. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As to claims 2, 11, and 19, the Office states that “Maurille does not teach redundant logical components from the document.” However, the Office asserts that “Costales teaches redundant logical components from the document.” (col. 4, lines 10-25). Accordingly, the Office asserts that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maurille and Costales to have a redundant logical components from the document because it would have an efficient system that can provide to be used to guard the primary system from failure by acting as a back up system.”

It is unclear what the relevance is of these assertions because of the absence of elements of claims 2, 11, and 19, specifically, the absence of any reference whatsoever of the claimed feature of removing redundant logical components from a generated document or medium. However, these rejections are moot in light of the cancellation of claims 2, 11, and 19. Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully request additional clarification regarding these seemingly at-odds interpretations be provided in the next communication because independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 have each been amended to include elements similar to those found in former claims 2, 11, and 19.

To the extent that the Office meant that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maurille and Costales to remove redundant logical components from a generated document, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Costales relates to a method wherein “information common to multiple e-mail messages (called common content “chunks”) is separated from the individual e-mail messages before transmission.” (Abstract) “The chunks are then transmitted separately from the individual e-mail message information and reassembled into a complete e-mail message at the receiving site.” (Col. 3, lines 28-33).

As stated above, claim 1 recites a method for presenting email threads, comprising the steps of identifying the logical components of each message in a thread, determining the relationships between the messages in the thread using the logical components, and generating a document based upon the determined relationships, wherein any logical components that are identified in each of the messages in the thread are removed during the generating step so that the generated document does not include the redundant logical


components. While Costales teaches that "information common to multiple e-mail messages (called common content "chunks") is separated from the individual e-mail messages before transmission," Costales also teaches that he chunks are "reassembled into a complete e-mail message at the receiving site." (Col. 3, lines 28-33). Costales does not teach or suggest to generate a document based upon the relationships between messages in an e-mail thread using logical components, wherein any logical components that are identified in each of the messages in the thread are removed during the generating step so that the generated document does not include the redundant logical components.

Thus, the combined teachings of Maurille and Costales fail to render obvious the claimed features of claim 1. Similarly, the combined teachings of Maurille and Costales also fail to render obvious the claimed features of claims 10, 18, and 26, each of which require that any redundant logical components be removed. In the absence of additional explanation regarding these claimed elements, Application respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, and 20-27 are in condition for immediate allowance.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/7/05



Joseph A. Parisi
Registration No. 53,435

NIXON PEABODY LLP
c/o Gunnar G. Leinberg
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603-1051
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600